REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Claims 24, 29-33, 38-41 and 57-59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Hogle.

Claims 42-53 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hogle in view of Wong. As to Claim 49, the Claim has been amended to include inherent language noting the common screen memory for the multiple display controllers and that the plurality of display controllers, included on the single video graphics card, each can have access to the differing screen memory portions of the common screen memory through the coupling module. Applicants also note that the office action on page 13 failed to address the claim language with respect to the coupling module. The office action equates the forking display driver 201 with the coupling controller as claimed.

The Hogle reference is of the type referred to in applicant's background of the invention section which employs two separate video graphics cards or video graphics adapters that are dedicated to each respective display. Each graphic adapter in Hogle is hard wired to a display port which couples to a dedicated display, as shown for example in Figure 6 of Hogle. The device adapter 36 is dedicated to monitor 37 and the device adapter 2 is dedicated to monitor 2. Among other differences, Claim 49 requires that the coupling module, alleged to be the forking display driver 201 of Hogle, includes means for switching the plurality of display drivers and the plurality of display controllers to appropriate screen memory portions of the common screen memory, however, as shown for example in Figure 6 of Hogle, the device driver 2 does not access any screen memory of device adapter 1 nor does device adapter 1 access any screen memory of device adapter 2. Moreover, device adapter 2 and device adapter 1 are not coupled through a switch to a common screen memory. Each frame buffer of each device adapter in

Hogle is dedicated to a particular device adapter. As such, Hogle does not teach the claimed subject matter.

Other differences also include that the device driver is not coupled to both first and second screen memory portions of a common screen memories required in the claim. Again, the device driver 1 is dedicated for device adapter 1. Device adapter 1 has its own screen memory (frame buffer), which is not accessible by device adapter 2.

The dependent claims also add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter. For example, Claim 53 requires that the configuration properties cause the coupling controller to couple a first display controller, alleged to be a device adapter of Hogle, of the plurality of display controllers to a first and second display of the plurality of displays. However, as shown in Figure 6, a device adapter 36 or 205 is not coupled to both displays but to the contrary, each device adapter is dedicated to a particular monitor. As such, the reference does not teach the claimed subject matter. This claim is also a condition for allowance. Other differences for the other dependent claims will be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art. It is also noted that the Examiner indicates that the common screen memory is described at column 6, lines 56 to column 7, line 5 of Hogle. This portion however refers to the "frame buffer" of each respective device adapter. The cited portion refers to bit block transfers that are performed within a same screen memory for a respective video adapter. In other words, it describes a bit block transfer from one screen memory portion within a dedicated screen memory or frame buffer to another portion within the same frame buffer. However, each frame buffer described in Hogle is dedicated to a particular adapter. Claim 50 requires, for example, that the coupling controller couples a first screen memory portion to more than one of the plurality of display controllers. Hogle does not teach such structure or operation since he teaches a dedicated frame buffer to

14

each single adapter. A frame buffer is not coupled to a plurality of adapters in Hogle. Accordingly, the claim is a condition for allowance.

As for Claims 57 and 58, the claims require, among other things, that the coupling controller reconfigures by dynamically connecting multiple display controllers to differing of the multiple displays. The current configuration of multiple displays can be reconfigured. The configuring discussion described in Hogle, however, refers to configuring the screen size of the virtual desktop. As noted above, Hogle does not dynamically connect multiple display controllers to differing multiple displays as part of a reconfiguration scheme. To the contrary, as shown in Figure 6, each display controller of Hogle, namely the vice adapters, are dedicated to particular monitors. There is no dynamic connecting of the device adapters to differing multiple displays as part of a reconfiguration process. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are also a condition for allowance. The dependant claim adds additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

As to Claims 24 and 33, applicants respectfully note that the claim requires, for example, to reconfigure <u>operable coupling of the multiple displays</u> to the computing system such that the multiple displays are configured in accordance with the display preferences when the current configuration can be reconfigured. The steps referred to in Claim 24 refer to the operation of the "coupling controller" and the coupling controller reconfigures by coupling or connecting of the multiple displays of the computing system as part of a reconfiguration process as claimed. In contrast, the forking display controller of Hogle does not connect or disconnect multiple displays to reconfigure them, but instead merely splits display streams amongst differing device drivers as described.

In addition, applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks above with respect to the common screen memory as Hogle does not teach such memory in connection with the display controllers as claimed nor the coupling controllers claimed.

Also, the office action alleges that the current application does not describe a single display controller. However, applicants respectfully note that page 6 lines 5-14, page 9 lines 1-16 and elsewhere describe a system where a single display controller may be coupled to multiple displays.

In addition the claims require that the display controllers coupled to a display plurality of display drivers each of the display drivers writing separate display data to the plurality of screen memories. Again, as shown in Hogle each device driver 35 or 203 is dedicated to a given device controller 36 or 205 respectively and each does not write to a plurality of screen memory of a common screen memory. Applicants respectfully submit that the reference also does not teach the claimed subject matter.

New claim 60 which depends on claim 57 requires that the coupling controller reconfigures by dynamically connecting multiple display controllers to differing of the multiple displays. Again as noted above, the cited references either alone or in combination do not teach this claimed subject matter. As such, this claim is also believed to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 19, 2008

By: /Christopher J. Reckamp
    Christopher J. Reckamp
    Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder Price P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005